

Zeroth law of thermodynamics and the transformation from nonextensive to extensive framework

Ramandeep S. Johal

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Technical University, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

Within the nonextensive framework, it is shown that zeroth law of thermodynamics determines not only the mapping between Lagrange multipliers and intensive variables, but also the mapping between nonextensive and extensive entropy. The form of constraints decides the form of the extensive entropy, standard averages lead to Boltzmann-Shannon-Gibbs entropy while normalised biased averages lead to Renyi entropy. The mapping between Lagrange multipliers and intensive variables is also discussed in the more general context of composable entropy.

PACS Number(s): 05.20.-y, 05.70.-a, 05.90.+m

In recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in the generalized entropy satisfying the following non-additive property

$$S_q(A+B) = S_q(A) + S_q(B) + (1-q)S_q(A)S_q(B), \quad (1)$$

where A and B represent two independent subsystems composing a larger system $(A+B)$ and q is a real parameter. This form of non-additivity is the simplest example [1] for a composable entropy consistent with thermodynamic equilibrium. Let p_i be the probability distribution set characterising the discrete microstates $i = 1, \dots, W$ of the system. The generalized entropy satisfies the condition that for $q \rightarrow 1$, S_q goes to Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon (BGS) entropy, $S = -\sum_{i=1}^W p_i \ln p_i$ and one recovers the usual additivity of entropy from (1). An explicit realisation of such an entropic form is popularly known as Tsallis entropy [2]

$$S_q^{(T)} = \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^W p_i^q}{q-1}. \quad (2)$$

It is concave for all positive values of q and has been proposed as a basis to generalize the standard Boltzmann-Gibbs (BG) thermostatics. The motivation for this proposal is to be able to treat the nonextensivity inherent in many physical systems and also to deal with those anomalous systems where the BG formalism fails to give well defined results [3]. Indeed, nonextensivity plays important role in systems with long range interactions such as astrophysical systems [4], ferroic materials [5], systems with non-separable or overlapping parts such as in quantum entanglement [6], and broadly speaking in many nonequilibrium phenomena.

In the Tsallis formalism, a maximisation problem for $S_q^{(T)}$ is formulated, imposing as constraints the generalized mean values of the form [7]

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^W p_i^q E_{k,i}}{\sum_{j=1}^W p_j^q} = E_k^{(q)}, \quad (k = 1, \dots, n), \quad (3)$$

alongwith the normalisation of probability, $\sum_{i=1}^W p_i = 1$. Thus it may be taken as a generalization of Jaynes' approach to statistical mechanics. The resulting non-canonical distributions are found to be power-law type,

$$p_i \sim \left[1 - (1-q) \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^{(T)} (E_{k,i} - E_k^{(q)}) / \sum_j p_j^q \right]^{1/(1-q)}, \quad (4)$$

where $\eta_k^{(T)}$ are the n number of Lagrange multipliers associated with the constraints (3). The Tsallis statistical weight reduces to the usual exponential Boltzmann factor, for $q \rightarrow 1$. Such generalised distributions have been found to fit the experimental data very well in many different situations; some of the more recent applications are fully developed turbulence [8], financial markets [9], anomalous diffusion in Hydra cellular aggregates [10], CMR manganites [11] and hadronic jets [12], to name a few [13]. Realising the apparent success of Tsallis-type distributions in realistic situations, there has been a growing interest to justify or clarify the premises of thermodynamic formalism based on the modified postulates. In this context, some of the important issues are: uniqueness of the generalised entropy [14], physical interpretation of the nonextensivity index q [15] and possibility of fixing its appropriate value from the theory [16], and statistical mechanical foundations for nonexponential distributions [17].

Another crucial issue within the Tsallis formalism, has been the interpretation of Lagrange multipliers [18,19] entering the maximum entropy problem. It has been found that these parameters are not intensive in nature, unlike their counterparts appearing in the standard Boltzmann-Gibbs (BG) formalism and so are not the ones which control mutual equilibrium between independent subsystems (such as common temperature, pressure, etc.). Speaking in the context of canonical ensemble, the appropriate physical temperature has to be defined from the generalized zeroth law of thermodynamics. Somewhat unexpectedly, the forms of thermodynamic relations are the same as in the extensive framework, when the calculations are done using the intensive variables [19,20]. More precisely, it has been suggested that a mapping from the nonextensive Tsallis formalism to an extensive thermodynamic formalism can be defined [21], which basically involves the following two transformations:

$$S^{*(e)} = \frac{\ln [1 + (1-q)S^{*(n)}]}{(1-q)}, \quad (5)$$

where for a given *maximum* (denoted by $*$) nonextensive entropy $S^{*(n)}$, there exists an extensive entropy $S^{*(e)}$ with the same concavity as $S^{*(n)}$, provided $q < 1$. Also, we have

$$\eta_k = \frac{\tilde{\eta}_k}{[1 + (1 - q)S^{*(n)}]}. \quad (6)$$

Here $\tilde{\eta}_k$ is the Lagrange multiplier connected with the maximisation of $S^{*(n)}$ and η_k is the corresponding intensive variable satisfying $\eta_k(A) = \eta_k(B)$ for two systems A and B in mutual thermodynamic equilibrium. The transformations (5) and (6) were obtained in [21] by using scaling property of the nonextensive entropy (1) for equilibrium states and requiring that the standard form of the Gibbs-Duhem equation is preserved. Now since this treatment assumes a priori, the explicit form of nonextensive entropy to be Tsallis type (2), the extensive entropy obtained from (5) is fixed to be Renyi entropy of order q [22]

$$S_q^{(R)} = \frac{\ln \sum_i p_i^q}{1 - q}. \quad (7)$$

However, as the standard extensive thermodynamic formalism is based on the BGS entropy, it is also desirable to clarify how the formalism based on nonextensive entropy may be mapped to the one based on BGS entropy. It appears that the choice of Tsallis entropy is not appropriate to meet this requirement.

In this paper, we show that the proposed mapping from nonextensive to extensive framework (both transformations (5) and (6)) can be derived by applying the generalized zeroth law of thermodynamics for the nonextensive entropy and the assumption of a Legendre Transform structure for extensive entropy. Note that the intensive character of the variables defined by (6) was pointed out in [19] by applying the generalized zeroth law of thermodynamics to the Tsallis entropy at equilibrium. The essential part in the present approach is that the explicit form of nonextensive entropy is not assumed a priori, but is derived from the condition of equilibrium. In this sense, the zeroth law of thermodynamics fixes the general form of the nonextensive entropy as a specific function of an extensive entropy. Moreover, it will be seen that the form of extensive constraints (whether usual averages or normalised biased averages) decides that the mapped onto extensive entropy is BGS or Renyi entropy.

Consider the thermodynamic equilibrium between two systems A and B , characterised by a state of maximum nonextensive entropy $\tilde{S}_q^*$ with fixed values of the extensive quantities

$$E_k(A + B) = E_k(A) + E_k(B), \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (8)$$

As in standard thermodynamics, we define the thermodynamic equilibrium entropy for the nonextensive case to be $k_B \tilde{S}_q^*(E_1, \dots, E_k, \dots, E_n)$, where k_B is the Boltzmann's constant. Apparently, $\tilde{S}_q^*$ is the explicit entropy function

in terms of the given extensive constraints and is obtained from the equilibrium distribution $\{p_i^*\}$ following from the maximisation of $\tilde{S}_q(p_i)$.

Now assuming that the joint entropy $\tilde{S}_q^*(A + B)$ satisfies (1), we can make the variations $\delta \tilde{S}_q^*(A + B)$ and $\delta E_k(A + B)$ vanish for the equilibrium state, to obtain

$$[1 + (1 - q)\tilde{S}_q^*(B)] \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_q^*(A)}{\partial E_k(A)} = [1 + (1 - q)\tilde{S}_q^*(A)] \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_q^*(B)}{\partial E_k(B)}, \quad (9)$$

where $\tilde{S}_q^*(A)$ implies $\tilde{S}_q^*(E_1(A), \dots, E_k(A), \dots, E_n(A))$ and similarly for the system B . On rearranging (9), we can write

$$\frac{1}{[1 + (1 - q)\tilde{S}_q^*(A)]} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_q^*(A)}{\partial E_k(A)} = \frac{1}{[1 + (1 - q)\tilde{S}_q^*(B)]} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_q^*(B)}{\partial E_k(B)} = \eta_k. \quad (10)$$

As each side of the above equation pertains to independent systems A and B , we equate it to a constant η_k . Dropping the index A or B , we have the differential equation for nonextensive entropy of each subsystem

$$\frac{1}{[1 + (1 - q)\tilde{S}_q^*]} \frac{\partial}{\partial E_k} \tilde{S}_q^*(E_1, \dots, E_k, \dots, E_n) = \eta_k, \quad (11)$$

which can be integrated to give

$$\frac{\ln [1 + (1 - q)\tilde{S}_q^*]}{(1 - q)} = \eta_k E_k + \psi, \quad (12)$$

where, the constant of integration ψ is by definition, independent of E_k and in general, $\psi \equiv \psi(E_1, \dots, E_{k-1}, E_{k+1}, \dots, E_n; \eta_k)$. Choosing ψ to be a thermodynamic potential equivalent to a free energy with the property $E_k = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \eta_k}$, the rhs of (12) defines the Legendre transform $S^*(E_1, \dots, E_k, \dots, E_n)$ of ψ with the property $\eta_k = \frac{\partial S^*}{\partial E_k}$ [23]. In other words, the quantity on rhs of (12) is taken to be an entropy function. It can be easily verified that lhs of (12) defines an extensive quantity (S^*). Thus we obtain the transformation (5). Conversely, the explicit form of the maximum nonextensive entropy is given by

$$\tilde{S}_q^* = \frac{e^{(1-q)S^*} - 1}{(1 - q)}. \quad (13)$$

Using the concavity property of $\tilde{S}_q^*(\{E_k\})$, we infer that $S^*(\{E_k\})$ is concave, provided $q \leq 1$.

We consider the two types of averaging schemes:

- (i) *usual averages*, implying fixed values of $\sum_i p_i E_{k,i}$ given as constraints. Then the entropy S^* can be taken as the standard BGS entropy.
- (ii) *normalised biased averages*, as in Tsallis' statistical mechanics. Then the extensive entropy function may be

chosen to be Renyi entropy, which satisfies the Legendre transform structure with this type of averaging scheme. Here we are free to choose Renyi entropy of order q' . Then the entropy obtained from (13) is a two parameter (q, q') dependent nonextensive entropy, which for $q = q'$, reduces to Tsallis entropy. For concavity, we also require $q' \leq 1$.

Next we focus on the equilibrium probability distribution obtained from the maximisation of entropy form (13). Below we discuss for the case of more general (q, q') -entropy. First note that maximising $S_{q'}^{(R)}$, the Renyi entropy of order q' , under the normalised biased scheme with fixed values of

$$\frac{\sum_i p_i^{q'} E_{k,i}}{\sum_j p_j^{q'}} = E_k^{(q')}, \quad (k = 1, \dots, n) \quad (14)$$

gives the following equilibrium distribution [24]

$$p_i \sim \left[1 - (1 - q') \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^{(R)} (E_{k,i} - E_k^{(q')}) \right]^{1/(1-q')}. \quad (15)$$

Now if we maximise the nonextensive entropy

$$\tilde{S}_q = \frac{e^{(1-q)S_{q'}^{(R)}} - 1}{(1-q)}. \quad (16)$$

under the constraints (14), we get a similar distribution as (15) with the same exponent $1/(1-q')$, but with Lagrange multiplier $\tilde{\eta}_k$ related as $\tilde{\eta}_k = \eta_k^{(R)} [1 + (1-q)\tilde{S}_q^*]$, where $\tilde{S}_q^*$ is the maximum value of (13). This is evident, as the nonextensive entropy (16) is a continuous, monotonic increasing function of the extensive entropy $S_{q'}^{(R)}$ and so will give the same equilibrium distribution as the latter under identical constraints. However, an important point to note here is that the exponent of the power-law type equilibrium distribution is *not* necessarily related to the degree of nonextensivity of the entropy [25], equivalent to $(1-q)$ in the present case. Finally, for $q' = 1$, we get case (i) above, the constraints reducing to the standard mean values and extensive entropy is the BGS. In this case, the maximisation of $\tilde{S}_q$ gives *exponential* distributions.

Next, we discuss the mapping between Lagrange multipliers of the entropy maximisation problems and the intensive variables, in a general context. We assume that for a general entropic function S , the relation $\frac{\partial S}{\partial E_k} = \eta_k$ defines the Lagrange parameter associated with the constraint quantity E_k , occurring in the maximum entropy problem. If the entropy is extensive (additive), then from zeroth law of thermodynamics, we derive that the Lagrange multiplier η_k is also the intensive variable conjugate to E_k . However, this equivalence breaks down if the entropy becomes non-extensive. Thus consider a more general entropy written as $\tilde{S} \equiv F(S)$, a nonlinear, continuous, monotonic increasing function of S . Then due

to the fact that $\partial \tilde{S} / \partial E_k = (d\tilde{S}/dS)(\partial S / \partial E_k)$, we can write as

$$\tilde{\eta}_k = \frac{d\tilde{S}}{dS} \eta_k, \quad (17)$$

i.e. the Lagrange multipliers of the two maximisation problems can be related this way. Now if S is an extensive entropy, then (17) also defines the transformation between the Lagrange multiplier of a nonextensive entropy and the corresponding intensive variable, equivalent to (6).

Further insight into this relationship can be gained by using the notion of composability of entropy [26]. An arbitrary entropic form $\tilde{S}$ is defined to be composable, if the total $\tilde{S}(A, B)$ for the composite system can be written as $\tilde{S}(A, B) = f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)]$, where $f[\cdot]$ is a certain bivariate function of the C^2 class and symmetric in its arguments, $f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)] = f[\tilde{S}(B), \tilde{S}(A)]$. Suppose this general entropy determines the equilibrium between subsystems A and B under the given extensive constraints (3). By equating the variations of the total entropy and total value of the constraint quantity to zero, we get

$$\frac{\partial f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)]}{\partial \tilde{S}(A)} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}(A)}{\partial E_k(A)} = \frac{\partial f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)]}{\partial \tilde{S}(B)} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}(B)}{\partial E_k(B)}. \quad (18)$$

To establish an intensive variable common to the two subsystems in equilibrium, it is essential to have the following factorization [1]

$$\frac{\partial f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)]}{\partial \tilde{S}(A)} = k[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)] g[\tilde{S}(A)] h[\tilde{S}(B)], \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{\partial f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)]}{\partial \tilde{S}(B)} = k[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)] h[\tilde{S}(A)] g[\tilde{S}(B)], \quad (20)$$

where $g[\cdot]$ and $h[\cdot]$ are some functions, in particular $h[\cdot]$ will be required to be a differentiable one. The function $k[\cdot]$ is not in the factorised form. Then it can be shown that

$$\frac{1}{g[\tilde{S}(A)]} \frac{dh[\tilde{S}(A)]}{d\tilde{S}(A)} = \frac{1}{g[\tilde{S}(B)]} \frac{dh[\tilde{S}(B)]}{d\tilde{S}(B)} = \omega, \quad (21)$$

where ω is a constant. Moreover, $k[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)] = G(f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)])$, where $G(\cdot)$ is an arbitrary function. Now the identification of an intensive variable is possible only if it is independent of the function $k[\cdot]$. Therefore, using (19), (20), and (21) in (18), we must have

$$\frac{1}{\omega} \frac{1}{h[\tilde{S}(A)]} \frac{dh[\tilde{S}(A)]}{d\tilde{S}(A)} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}(A)}{\partial E_k(A)} = \frac{1}{\omega} \frac{1}{h[\tilde{S}(B)]} \frac{dh[\tilde{S}(B)]}{d\tilde{S}(B)} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}(B)}{\partial E_k(B)} = \eta_k, \quad (22)$$

where η_k is the intensive variable conjugate to the constraint E_k . The constant ω has been kept as in principle,

it can vanish. Using the definition of Lagrange multiplier of $\tilde{S}$, we obtain for each subsystem

$$\frac{1}{\omega} \frac{1}{h[\tilde{S}]} \frac{dh[\tilde{S}]}{d\tilde{S}} \tilde{\eta}_k = \eta_k. \quad (23)$$

This is the most general relation between the Lagrange multiplier of a composable entropy and the corresponding intensive variable as derived from the zeroth law of thermodynamics.

The function h can be fixed further if we assume that the general composable entropy $\tilde{S}$ is some monotonic increasing function of an extensive entropy S . In other words, assuming that (17) holds and using it in (23), we obtain after integration

$$h[S] = \exp(\omega S + c). \quad (24)$$

Note that h comes out as an explicit function of the extensive entropy S . Lastly, we remark for the special case of $k[\cdot]$ as constant function equal to unity. Using (21) in (19) or (20) and solving for the composability function, we get

$$f[\tilde{S}(A), \tilde{S}(B)] = \frac{1}{\omega} h[S(A)] h[S(B)] + c'. \quad (25)$$

Choosing the constants of integration $c = 0$ and $c' = -1/\omega$ in the above, gives back the solution (13) for nonextensive entropy with $\omega = (1 - q)$.

Concluding, it has been observed recently in literature that thermodynamic structure based on the nonextensive Tsallis entropy can be mapped to the one based on extensive Renyi entropy. In the present paper, we have studied this mapping by establishing the zeroth law of thermodynamics, which is shown to determine not only the transformation between Lagrange multipliers and intensive variables, but also between nonextensive and extensive entropy. The said mapping can be made to the BGS or Renyi entropy based extensive framework, depending on the form of extensive constraints. We also remarked that the exponent in Tsallis-type power-law distributions, is not necessarily related to the nonextensivity of entropy. Rather nonextensivity of entropy seems only to make the Lagrange multipliers entering the maximum entropy problem as non-intensive. We have discussed the relation between Lagrange multiplier and intensive variables for the general case of composable entropy and determined the form of function h when the composable entropy is a monotonic increasing function of an extensive entropy. The present analysis treats nonextensivity of entropy keeping the external constraints as extensive. A more general study can be made by making the constraints also as nonextensive. The obtained relations between for example, the Lagrange multipliers and intensive variables will also be then generalised.

The financial support from Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Bonn, Germany, is gratefully acknowledged.

- [1] S. Abe, Phys. Rev. E **63**, 061105 (2001).
- [2] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. **52**, 479 (1988).
- [3] C. Tsallis, *Nonextensive statistical mechanics and its applications* eds. S. Abe and Y. Okamoto (Springer, Berlin, 2001).
- [4] T. Padmanabhan, astro-ph/0206131.
- [5] V.K. Wadhawan, *Introduction to Ferroic Materials* (Gordon and Breach, UK, 2000).
- [6] N. Canosa and R. Rossignoli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 170401 (2002).
- [7] C. Tsallis, R.S. Mendes, and A.R. Plastino, Physica A **261**, 534 (1998).
- [8] F.M. Ramos, R.R. Rosa, and C. Rodrigues Neto, cond-mat/9907348; C. Beck, Physica A **277**, 115 (2000); T. Arimitsu and N. Arimitsu, J. Phys. A **33**, L235 (2000) [Corrigenda: **34**, 673 (2001)].
- [9] F. Michael and M.D. Johnson, cond-mat/0108017, cond-mat/0204261; L. Borland, cond-mat/0205078.
- [10] A. Upadhyaya, J.-P. Rieu, J.A. Glazier, and Y. Sawada, Physica A **293**, 549 (2001).
- [11] M.S. Reis, et. al., Europhys. Lett. **58**, 42 (2002).
- [12] I. Bediaga, E.M.F. Curado, and J. Miranda, Physica A **286**, 156 (2000).
- [13] A complete list of the research contributions devoted to the Tsallis formalism and applications can be found at the URL <http://tsallis.cat.cbpf.br/biblio.htm>
- [14] R.J.V. dos Santos, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 4104 (1997); S. Abe, Phys. Lett. A **271**, 74 (2000); H. Suyari, math-ph/0205004.
- [15] R.S. Johal, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 4147 (1998); G. Wilk and Z. Włodarczyk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2770 (2000); L.S.F. Olavo, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 036125 (2001).
- [16] M.L. Lyra and C. Tsallis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 53 (1998); F. Baldovin and A. Robledo, cond-mat/0205371.
- [17] A.K. Rajagopal and S. Abe, in Classical and Quantum Complexity and Nonextensive Thermodynamics, eds. P. Grigolini, C. Tsallis and B.J. West, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals **13**, Number 3, 529 (Pergamon-Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2002).
- [18] S.K. Rama, Phys. Lett. A **276**, 103 (2000).
- [19] S. Abe, S. Martinez, F. Pennini, and A. Plastino, Phys. Lett. A **281**, 126 (2001).
- [20] R. Toral, cond-mat/0106060.
- [21] E. Vives and A. Planes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 020601 (2002).
- [22] A. Renyi, *Probability Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970).
- [23] H.B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an introduction to Thermostatistics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1985).
- [24] E.K. Lenzi, R.S. Mendes, and L.R. da Silva, Physica A **280**, 337 (2000).
- [25] This was originally pointed out in the case of generalized entropy in R.S. Johal, cond-mat/9909185.
- [26] M. Hotta and I. Joichi, Phys. Lett. A **262**, 302 (1999).